

**REMARKS**

***Summary of Amendments***

1. Claims 1-8 were originally submitted in this case. Claims 9-12 were added in an amendment dated June 19, 2006. Claims 10-12 were canceled and claim 13 added in an amendment dated March 7, 2007. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, and 13 have been canceled in this paper. Claim 1 has been amended, as described in more detail below, to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the instant invention. Claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 remain pending.
2. It is noted that on the Office Action Summary sheet heading the current PTO communication, the Examiner checked both box 2a) and box 2b), which would suggest that the May 10, 2007 Office action is both final and non-final. Since the Detailed Action (pages 2-4) makes no mention of the outstanding action being final, it is presently being assumed that box 2a) was inadvertently checked and that the May 10, 2007 Office action is non-final.

***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112***

3. Claims 1-9 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, with regard to claim 1, the Examiner states, "The new limitation of the cross-section being trapezoidal is new matter." In the present paper, claim 1 has been amended to remove the limitation of the cross-section being trapezoidal. And the Examiner's comments pertaining to claims 2 and 9 are moot since those claims have been canceled in this paper.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102***

4. Claims 1-9 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by both U.S. Pat. No. 5,688,331 to Aruga et al., and Japanese Unexamined Pat. App. Pub. No. H09-045758 to Nagasaki.
5. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection to the extent that it is pertinent to independent claim 1, as amended. Claim 1 has been amended to recite: "wherein the diameter **b** minus the diameter **a** is less than 1 mm." This amendment is supported by the original specification, Table 1, Numbers 9-18, such that no new matter has been added and no new search should be required.
6. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as amended, now distinguishes patentably over the prior art of record. In particular, none of the prior art references of record teach, or even suggest, a wafer holder having a relative

relationship between the diameter of the wafer carrying face (diameter **a** in claim 1) and the diameter of the side opposite the wafer carrying face (diameter **b** in claim 1) such that **b** – **a** is less than 1 mm. *Aruga et al.* and *Nagasaki* clearly disclose cross sectional shapes in which the difference is greater than 1 mm. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the § 102 rejections of independent claim 1 have been overcome.

7. It is therefore respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, as amended, should be held allowable for the reasons set forth above in Sections 5 and 6 of this paper. It follows that dependent claims 3, 5, and 7 must also be allowable, since these dependent claims carry with them all the elements of independent claim 1 to which they ultimately refer.

Accordingly, Applicant courteously urges that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is requested. Favorable action by the Examiner at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

August 10, 2007

/James Judge/

James W. Judge  
Registration No. 42,701

**JUDGE & MURAKAMI IP ASSOCIATES**  
Dojima Building, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
6-8 Nishitemma 2-Chome, Kita-ku  
Osaka-shi 530-0047  
JAPAN

Telephone: **305-938-7119**  
Voicemail/Fax: **703-997-4565**